Sri B. E. RAMIAH.—Because, this is a very important question in the interest of those villages. So many houses are destroyed due to floods.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಚುಕ್ಕೆ ಗುರುತಿನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ 15 ದಿವಸಗಳೊಳಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಪರೀಕ್ಷಿಸಿದೆ. 15 ದಿವಸಗಳು ಇನ್ನೂ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ, ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಏನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ? ಪ್ರವಾಹ ಬಂದರೆ ನಾನು ಏನುಮಾಡಲಿ? ಈ ಸೆಷನ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. 15 ದಿವಸ ಇನ್ನೂ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ನಿಮ್ಮದು ಮಹತ್ವದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಏನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ;

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಆಂಜನಪ್ಪ (ಸಿರಾ).—ನನ್ನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಕೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು ನಾನು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಹೆಸರನ್ನು ಕೂಗಿದ ಕಾಲಕ್ಕೆ ನೀವು ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಗಂಟೆ ಕಾಲ ಮುಗಿದಮೇಲೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಅವಕಾಶಕೊಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ನೀವು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದು; ನಾನು ಅದನ್ನು ಎನ್‌ಫೋರ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಆಂಜನಪ್ಪ.—ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ ಪುಸ್ತಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾದರೂ ಪ್ರಿಂಟ ಮಾಡಿಸಿ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಅದನ್ನು ರೂಲ್ಸ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನೋಡೋಣ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ (ತಿಪಟೂರು).—ಈ ಸಾರಿ ನಾವು ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೋ ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೆಲವಕ್ಕೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿದೆ, ಕೆಲವು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಂಥವುಗಳನ್ನು ಮುಂದಿನ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸುತ್ತೀರಾ?

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಈಗ ನೀವು ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಅವುಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ಯಾವ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಆ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳೆಲ್ಲವೂ ಲ್ಯಾಪ್ಸ್ ಆಗುತ್ತವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ರೇವಣ್ಣಸಿದ್ದಪ್ಪ.—ಹೊಸ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕು.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಹೊಸ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಕೇಳಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಕೆ. ಪುಟ್ಟರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಚನ್ನಪಟ್ಟಣ).—ಯಾರು ಯಾರು ಗಲಾಟೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅಂಥವರ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಉತ್ತರ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನನ್ನ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಒಂದೂ ಉತ್ತರ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ನೀವು ಗಲಾಟೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

Sri J. H. SHAMSUDDIN (Deputy Minister for Finance).—Sir, I beg to lay on the Table:

"The Mysore Sugar-Cane Cess Rules, 1959, dated 11th May 1959 issued under sub-sections (1) and (2) of Section 26 of the Mysore Sugar-Cane Cess Act, 1958.

Amendments to the Mysore Sales Tax Rules, 1957, dated 20th October 1958 issued under sub-sections (1) and (2) of Section 38 of the Mysore Sales Tax Act, 1957."

MYSORE ELECTRICITY (TAXATION ON CONSUMPTION) BILL, 1959.

Motion to consider (Continued).

†Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE (Chikodi).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, I was referring yesterday to the provisions of clause 3 of the Bill. Clause 3 of the Bill purports to levy a tax on the consumption. I am referring, Sir, specifically to the proviso (*a*). It reads:

> "Provided that where the units of energy supplied to a consumer are not determined by a meter, but-
>
> (*a*) the units of energy consumed are determined on the basis of any formula adopted by the licensee, the electricity tax shall be levied and paid on the units of energy determined on the basis of such formula;'

I have got to make a reference to this to explain this issue. The Board has said that for the purpose of minimum monthly charge, the basis would be the number of outlets. Outlets include not only the switch point but the plug point also. Supposing there are 20 outlets; the charge would be 30 units whether 30 units are actually consumed or not. If the consumption is more than 30 units, of course, there is some concession. We are not concerned with concession in this matter. My general experience is, usually so much is not consumed. I shall state my own case here as an illustration. Under the old Bombay Tariff Schedule which had nine annas per unit, I was paying only Rs. 9 on the basis of actual consumption. Bombay was charging only on the actual consumption and not constructive consumption as it is here, subject to the minimum of Rs. 2-8-0. Now, whether I consume the energy to the extent of 63 units out of 40 outlets or

not, I have to pay a minimum charge for 63 units which comes to something like 16 to 18 rupees. If that is the way this clause (a) is applied, I will be made to pay a tax on 63 units, even though I will not be able to consume that energy; that is the position. Therefore this clause has got to be considered.

Another aspect of the question is, when we start levying a tax, to what extent we should levy it. Unless the Schedule of Tariff is properly revised by the Mysore Electricity Board, I think, much injustice is likely to be caused. In Bombay Karnatak area, there is so much opposition against the imposition of tariffs on the basis of outlets. I do not understand why this system of imposing tariffs on the actual energy has gone. This has failed in Bombay State and other States. There is no reason why this particular departure is made. Sometimes it is based upon the number of outlets.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Minister for Public Works and Electricity).—This pertains to cases where the consumption is not determined by meters, where there are no meters. "Provided that where the units of energy supplied to a consumer are not determined by a meter..." In such cases we must arrive at consumption based on some formula agreed to by the licensee. It is that formula that will be utilised for the purpose of taxation.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA (Nanjangud).—What are those cases in which you contemplate meters not being provided? Because if you admit that you are not going to use meters in some cases, you are providing facilities for leakage of Government revenue.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—It is only where the units of energy consumed are not measured by a meter. You know there are licensees who supply power to consumers and by mutual agreement they might arrive at a formula.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—The plain meaning of (a) is very obvious.

"the units of energy consumed are determined on the basis of any formula adopted by the licensee, the electricity tax shall be levied and paid on the units of energy determined on the basis of such formula."

In the case of minimum charge, the formula is not actual energy consumed according to the meter reading, but it is something more than that, some factitious formula of consumption; that is, whether that energy is used or not, the man has to pay $1\frac{1}{2}$ times the outlet per unit. For 20, it would be 30; for 30, it would be 45. This case is actually covered by this clause. The plain meaning is that and if he does not mean this, let him bring in a suitable amendment.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—In regard to the minimum that is to be fixed, that is a matter which pertains to tariffs and here we are dealing only with the question of tax on the quantity consumed and in cases where minimum is fixed, that will be based on the quantum of electricity that is likely to be consumed and therefore when the consumer has agreed with the licensee to pay a certain minimum for electricity consumed, whether he consumes or not, that part of usage will be deemed for our purpose as the unit at which taxation is made. It is an agreement between the consumer and the licensee.

Sri S. D. KOTHAVALE.—There is no such agreement. It is a levy under the Electricity Act. I am referring to the tariff rates of the Electricity Board, because the tax here related to that; it is not independent of that. Tax should be levied on the actual consumption of energy; it should not be a factitious figure arrived at on the basis of some formula evolved by the Board. What is this formula? Of course, the Minister was pleased to say that it is a matter for the Board. I think that the Board is indirectly controlled by the Minister and by this House. Is not the Government in a position to give directions and to see that proper rates are levied. I do not understand the reason for recovering the tariffs on the basis of a factitious figure. The best method is, to impose tariffs on the energy actually consumed and not on some factitious

(SRI S. D. KOTHAVALE)

figure. When minimum energy is conserved on the basis of outlets, the only result of that will be, the cosumers of energy will reduce their outlets probably to their inconvenience and they will be compelled to do so. Sometimes in certain places for the occasional use of energy, some outlets are put there, which are rarely used and if the Board wants them to pay for that, it is inequitable. The very purpose of outlet basis can be defeated by having only one or two plugs. Whatever energy is consumed that should be the basis for the purpose of recovering tariffs and for the levy of tax. Therefore, I think the provision here is not correct and the heading of this clause 'Levy of tax on consumption of energy' is incorrect. My suggestion is that suitable amendment should be brought in to have an equitable tax. I am not opposing the levy of tax but what I say is it should be equitable.

As regards proviso to clause (*b*), it is difficult to understand it.

> "where flat rates are charged by the licensee for the supply of energy to any consumer, the electricity tax shall be levied and paid as follows :

For every lamp of less than 30 watts	Ten naye Paise per mensem.
For every lamp of 30 watts or more, but less than 40 watts	Thirteen naye Paise per mensem.
...	"

Probably the Bill or the Statement of Objects and Reasons does not explain for what purpose the flat rates are charged and upon what incidence the tax levy would be. But If I can draw an inference it would apply to street lighting. Probably such a flat rate applies to the supply of energy given to municipalities and panchayats which are making use of this energy for street lighting. Now this House will be pleased to know that in Bombay Karnatak area though there was a tax of half an anna per unit and one-fourth anna per unit, though there was such tax on consumption, street lighting was exempted.

Of course, the statement attached to the Bill on page 11 under sub-rule (1) of rule 70 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly explains the circumstances which necessitated this Bill and I understand why these local authorities have come in for taxation here. One thing, of course, may be considered here. Our Grama Panchayats and the Municipalities are having very difficult times and in these days when they are expected to go in for development activities, it is for us to encourage them by giving certain concessions.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—That is why they have got the exemption clause.

SRI S. D. KOTHAVALE.—As has been pointed out by my Hon'ble friend, there is power under the Bill to exempt them. But I do not understand why it should be levied and then exempted. The Bombay rules gave exemption to street lighting. My suggestion is that the Government may be pleased to grant such exemption in favour of street lighting. With these remarks, Sir, I support the Bill.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair.]

SRI C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY (Chickanaikanahalli).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, it is almost in the form of an ordinance that every Bill comes up before this House. Thus the very sanctity of the Bill is lost. After the formation of the Electricity Board the local bodies and panchayats are facing a lot of trouble. They are asking the local bodies to deposit one year's deposit. Even panchayats are also similarly asked to deposit. It is now very difficult even to get the spare parts. The Department itself which was fixing time-switches now does not undertake to do so. Some time ago it was fixed at Rs. 30. Now it is fixed at Rs. 200 and it is not possible to get them for less than Rs. 200 in the market How much the consumer is suffering after the formation of this Board is a point for consideration. The object as stated in the Bill is to bring uniform rate in all integrated parts. While bringing these

uniform laws, the Government always choose the higher tax obtaining in one of the areas and apply the same tax to all the other areas. In Hyderabad this tax is not levied and in some parts it is very low. Looking at the statement given by the Minister, he says:

> "The new tariff structure was framed recently and the Electricity Board took action to give effect to these rates from 1st July 1959. So far as taxation is concerned the position was as follows: In the Mysore Area the rates of taxes varied for different classes of consumers from 0.7 nP. per unit of energy consumed to 2 nP. per unit of energy consumed; and the tax structure was also complicated in actual working. In the Bombay Karnatak Area, the rates prevailing were ½ anna per unit for lighting (consumers utilising less than 12 units being exempted) and ¼ anna per 2 units for all other types of consumers, Government installations and street lights being exempted."

Except in one instance, nowhere has it been taxed more than 3 nP. But here in Section 3, you are stating 'not exceeding three naye paise'. You know rates are different for different uses, some rate for lighting, some rate for industrial energy, some rate for water supply and some rate for municipal supply, etc. But here you have stated simply 'not exceeding three naye paise'. You could have said so much for such and such kind of usage. By simply saying 'not exceeding three naye paise' you have asked for a blank cheque up to 3 naye paise per unit. The schedule of rates for different purposes has not been furnished here. Even from looking at the Bill, you can very well understand how the rates proposed are higher than what were existing. So, in the name of uniformity, the Government should not think of maximum rates. They must strike an average rate. You have not stated anywhere in this Bill how much you are going to realise, whether you are going to get less or more income. I think you are going to get double the income. Most of the parts are not taxed and you are now going to tax and you are going to increase the rate also.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I would like to state that the intention of the Government is not to enhance the present rate because we have fixed up the maximum at 3 naye paise. The object of this Bill is to keep that maximum so that at a later stage when Third Five-Year Plan and Fourth Five-Year Plan have got to be worked, if per chance it is necessary to augment the resources, there might be an enabling provision to empower the Government to do so. Therefore, it should not be misunderstood that the Government is anxious to enhance the rate rightaway at this moment. It is an enabling clause and the Government may go up to that. It does not mean that it shall go up to that now alone.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—The Government has got every right to bring an Amendment Bill whenever it likes and this House can admit it as it likes. Why do you go to the extent of taking so much power now alone?

Sri H. M CHANNABASAPPA.—The Hon'ble Member himself knows that in Bombay, it was half an anna per unit, about 12 units of exemption and we have said not exceeding 3 naye paise. We have to strike uniformity at some level.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—If the Government had said what exactly they were going to charge, it would have been all-right. This vague 3 naye paise is without justification. As Sri Kothavale said, what prevented the Government from adding another clause stating that as and when people applied for discontinuance for a specific period, this rate could be exempted. Here you have fixed only some flat rate on a slab system and whether a person uses the light or not, you are going to charge him. It is not the minimum that you have fixed here; nor it is the maximum. Therefore, I am telling that it is necessary to add another clause to section 3 stating "if any person wants to discontinue the usage of these lamps for a certain period on application, the Government may

(SRI C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY)

exempt him from these rates and ask him to pay some fixed minimum".

10 A.M.

Under Section 6, Government can appoint Inspecting Officers. Appointment would involve more expenditure.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA — That is not so. Appointment means that Government can ask the existing personnel also to do the work. For the purpose of the Act, it would be an appointment, so that the persons so appointed would derive powers under this Act.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—Appointment is different from delegation. The word 'appointment' denotes fresh recruitment.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—There are officers of the Electricity Board, Inspectors and Government Inspectors. Whoever is 'appointed' under this Act, would be deemed to be a public servant within the meaning of sub-section (3).

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—Sir, I would like to ask why Government is compelled to impose this tax. Consumers are paying for every unit of energy they use. Certain areas of Hyderabad enjoy exemption. Why not extend that exemption? Why extend the taxes to exempted areas?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Is the Hon'ble Member in favour of no taxes, no amenities, no tank restoration, no projects? etc. Let us all agree to that.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—That is not my idea. I am only pointing out that every unit of energy consumed is being paid for. This is a question of a tax over and above what a consumer is expected to pay for the service he derives.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The consumers are already paying it. It is not a new taxation. Even before integration we paid it and after integration we are paying. There seems to be a misconception. We are only bringing about uniformity. Where there was no taxation, we are imposing taxes.

Sri C. K. RAJAIAH SETTY.—Yes, but my grouse is that you are imposing taxes in the areas where there has been previously no such tax. In some areas taxes are to be increased. By this way Government would get twice the revenue.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—That is not correct. The income that we are likely to get would be of the order of 10 to 12 lakhs. We propose to continue the present level of taxation in most of the areas.

The House adjourned at Five Minutes past Ten of the Clock and re-assembled at Forty Minutes past Ten of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair.]

†Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sir, I rise to make a few observations on the Mysore Electricity (Taxation on Consumption) Bill. Fundamentally I am opposed to this Bill. One of the reasons for my opposing this Bill is in regard to the method adopted by the Government in introducing this taxation measure. They now want to validate the Ordinance passed by them by bringing in this measure before this Hon'ble House and getting its concurrence.

Sir, if we go into the history of the introduction of uniform tariff or uniform system of taxation, you will see that Government has not done things in a proper manner and at the appropriate time. If I remember correctly, the Government constituted what is known as N. N. Iyengar Committee as far back as October 57. The last of the series of its meetings were held jointly with the Electricity Board on the 12th May 58 and 23rd September 58. Government took as many as fourteen months after the Electricity Board came into existence to constitute under section 16 of the Act a Consultative Council of the Electricity Board, as late as 1st January 1959. I am only

referring to the delay that occurred due to Government not taking action at the appropriate time. That is one of the reasons why they want to push through this Bill in this manner. Government say, in advancing reasons for getting through the Ordinance, that the Electricity Board introduced a uniform tariff structure with effect from 1st July 59. What were the compelling reasons for the Government to have delayed taking action? There should have been a perfect liaison between the Electricity Board and the Government in regard to the introduction of this uniform tariff. While giving a statement under sub-rule (1) of rule 70 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly in respect of Mysore Electricity (Taxation on Consumption) Bill, 1959, Government say:

> "If a uniform rate of tax was not introduced with effect from the first meter reading date in each case in July 1959, the rates of taxes in the Mysore and Bombay Karnataka areas would be uneven and in several cases the rates of electricity tax along with the new tariff rates would be excessive."

These are all, I consider, lame excuses. This is bad planning. The whole point is this: When did Government pass orders on the N. N. Iyengar Committee report? What is the time lag between that and the date on which the Electricity Board attempted to introduce a uniform rate? Why did Government delay this matter? In fact that is where I find fault with Government. If timely action had been taken there would have been no need for the Government to resort to an ordinance. One other point. I wish the Government had mentioned somewhere that this is the amount the Government is likely to get. I do not know if the amount is shown in the Budget proposals for 1960-61. Every taxation measure is likely to be not acceptable to a large majority of the people. So Government must justify as to the necessity for this additional taxation measure. I am coming to that later.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—There is no additional taxation. In the areas where there was no taxation, for instance in Madras, Hyderabad and Coorg areas, electricity tax cannot be collected without proper legislation. In some of the areas in Hyderabad there was no tax at all.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—So this is an additional taxation measure so far as that area is concerned. To that extent you must admit that I am correct.

There are two important matters that have escaped the attention of Government. The first is, there is no provision of law giving scope for licensee system. In some of the northern districts of the State there are 18 or 20 licensees through whom you distribute this energy of power and there was a lot of agitation, if I remember correctly, even in Gadag—and this I mentioned during Budget discussion—for nationalisation of the distribution of the electricity supply system. What steps did Government take to bring in a legislation for licensing private owners of electricity? That is what is obtaining in Kerala and Madras. Government do not seem to understand the supreme need for it but they are very anxious to tax the people.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I would like to know whether it is the intention of the Hon'ble Member that we should have mentioned here what steps have been taken by Government?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Not that I wanted that to be mentioned here. What I am saying is, where it means collecting from the people, you will jump at the idea but where it is obligatory and is in the interest of the consumer you delay taking action.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The Hon'ble Member will perhaps be happy if I say that we have jumped at that idea also. The idea has caught the Government and a law is being prepared.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Then my second objection to this Bill is about the taxation itself. N. N. Iyengar Committee have made very valuable recommendations in regard to securing uniform tariff

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

structure throughout the State. In regard to this taxation I invite attention of the Hon'ble Minister and of the House to page 38 of N. N. Iyengar Committee report. They have added a very valuable paragraph on "Tax on Consumption of Electricity". For the information of the House and of the Hon'ble Speaker I wish to read it:

"Though the Hydro Tariffs have had to be revised upward to just cover the high costs of capacity expansions, the Committee believes that the new tariffs proposed are all promotional and will help to maintain the utilisation and further developments of the hydel power resources of this region. The recent levy......"

This is the relevant portion to which I want to draw your attention.

"of electricity taxes, however, on all classes of consumers, is a burden which the Committee would like to see removed; the taxes have increased the average price of electricity per unit from 5.18 nP. to 5.82 nP., by 12.4 per cent whereas the cost by capacity additions in the system increase the average rate from 5.18 nP. to 5.69 nP., *i.e.*, by 9.8 per cent only."

This is, in their own words, "a disproportionate levy on electricity which is no longer a luxury but a necessity for present day living and working."

They go further and champion the cause of the domestic consumer:

"The domestic consumer of electricity feels the taxes most burdensome. He is not in a position to recover the extra cost from any one else......"

as in the case of industrialists or persons who use electricity for commercial purposes. They say further:

"The Committee strongly recommends that this class of consumption at least be exempted from the taxes, if they cannot be abolished altogether."

The usual habit of Government is: they appoint a committee and get certain recommendations and they invariably accept the recommendations which are suitable to them and in cases of taxation they always jump at the idea. Where a recommendation is contrary to their accepted notions of of Government economy they will ignore it.

SRI H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—That is done in your interest and in the interest of the State.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—There is a lot of force in what the Iyengar Committee has suggested in regard to this taxation. I invite attention to page 33 of their report in regard to this industry. They state as follows:

"This (electricity) is an industry in which the ratio of annual turnover to total investment is exceptionally low, while the demand for expansion year after year is insistent and high. So, the industry can never expect to finance its future expansions adequately from any reserves to be built out of its revenues."

Why I am drawing attention to this is that at one stage Government have declared it as a policy that the Electricity Board should function on no-loss no-profit basis and that is item No. 1; Secondly, as for the average consumer there is an irresistible feeling that after the Electricity Board came into existence he is being penalised by additional taxation, call it surcharge or higher rate or whatever it is. But there is a feeling growing in the country that as a result of the coming into existence of the Electricity Board consumers are hard hit. An industrialist, persons engaged in small and cottage industries a man who has got irrigation pumping sets and the domestic consumer—every body uniformly feels throughout the country that there is something very wrong about it.

This is a feeling which must not be allowed to spread. On one side you are asking the Electricity Board to introduce a uniform rate structure and on the other hand you also go on introducing additional taxation. If you take a comprehensive picture you will find that ultimately the consumer suffers.

This is the feeling in the mind of the public and it cannot be controverted. You must seriously consider this matter. I know that this Bill will get through because you will join together and vote for it, but the point is that you have to see whether it is just or not.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—There is no question of any additional taxation. In the old Bombay, Madras and Coorg areas this taxation was there in some form or other. It is only in Hyderabad area that therewas no tax on electricity consumed. What we propose now is only to bring about uniformity all over the State so that there may not be inequity in the matter of taxation. The Hon'ble Member will agree that in a welfare State it is not desirable to tax only some people and leave out the rest. Either you must abolish the tax altogether or introduce it all over the State and bring about uniformity. If the Hon'ble Member's suggestion is that the tax should be abolished all over the State, that is a different matter.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I have already referred to the valuable recommendation of the N. N. Iyengar Committee which says that as a result of the introduction of uniform rate structure of electricity tax the increase in the levy will be more than 12 per cent. So how can you say that there will be no additional taxation? The average price of electricity which was 5·18 per unit has risen to 5·82.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—You are referring to the tariff structure. Some years ago there was a Committee appointed and according to its recommendation we introduced a certain tariff structure, but after experience we found that the incidence of the tariff was not equitable. So we appointed this Committee. Keeping in view that the Electricity Board will have to function on a 'No-profit-no-loss' basis and also keeping in view the high cost of maintenance, this Committee recommended a certain tariff structure and we have adopted it But our taxation structure is different. This taxation is in force in Mysore and we have not changed the taxation structure. It is only the tariff that has been raised by the Electricity Board; and so it will not be correct on the part of the Hon'ble Member to connect these two things. If Government had introduced additional taxation, then I could see the point in his argument. This only seeks to extend the taxation measure to certain new areas and it is not going to be immediately a burden on the consumer. Taking the tariff structure and the taxation structure together, in some cases the burden may be a little higher than what it was before, but by and large my information is that this taxation-cum-tariff will not seriously affect the consumer.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I would request the Hon'ble Minister to furnish this House with the figures of actual increase or decrease in the total recovery of tax as a result of this measure. We have got to look at it from the point of view of the consumer.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I can give that figure. For a consumption of 4 units at the rate of 26 nP. per unit the charge comes to 104 nP.; the rebate for prompt payment comes to 3 nP. and so the actual charge will work to 101 nP. for a consumption of 4 units and that comes to a rate of 25·04 nP. per unit. So the increase per unit is only 04 nP.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I want to know the total picture as a result of this tax structure. By how much will it strengthen the State coffers ?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—It will be of the order of Rs. 12 lakhs.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Do you mean to say that the additional revenue will be only Rs. 12 lakhs ?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—We have not taken into account the levy of this tax in Hyderabad Karnatak. If that is also taken into account the total would be Rs. 45 lakhs plus Rs. 12 lakhs, namely Rs. 57 lakhs.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Is this the way Government encourage industries, commerce and agricultural production ? It has been conceded that electricity is a necessity and not a luxury. Is this not a measure of taxation on a necessity ? I am not concerned with the revenue that you are likely to get. It may be Rs. 52

(SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA)

lakhs or Rs. 500 lakhs. What will happen if you tax a man who has got a fractional horse-power for his industry ? If you tax big people who use block power, it is not going to affect them much. But the present tariff structure is so designed that it will not affect them much. The persons who will be affected much by this tariff are the small industrialists and the consumers and especially the domestic consumers. You will have to revise the tariff from the point of view of the consumers.

Coming to some of the provisions of the Bill itself, I agree with my friend Sri Kothavale about the effect of clause 3. This purports to levy the tax on energy not actually consumed. This is a serious complaint that I have got to make against this clause. It has been said that the tax will be collected on the basis of any formula adopted by the licensee for determinig the energy consumed. It is not quite clear as to what is meant by this. Is it to be on the basis of an agreement between the consumer and the person who supplies the energy ? Is that formula acceptable to Government ? Or are they going to accept any principle agreed to between them ? Even if that is to the disadvantage of the consumer are they going to accept it ? Speaking generally about the drafting of the Bill, it is very badly worded and its implications are not clear. It leaves a lot of room for doubt. The Bill is framed in such a way that a layman like me cannot understand what exactly are the implications of many of the provisions of it.

SRI H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I do not think there is any room for ambiguity. Where the "units of energy consumed are determined on the basis of any formula adopted by the licensee, the electricity tax shall be levied and paid on the units of energy determined on the basis of such formula." We must have some basis upon which the units of energy consumed have to be determined. Where there is a meter there is no difficulty, but where without a meter electricity is being consumed as it is being done in a number of cases, there we have to have some basis upon which we have to calculate the electricity tax. Only in such cases we resort to the formula upon which the tariff is prescribed. For instance, there are street lights in the Bangalore Corporation area. Where the charge is prescribed as so much for lighting, on that basis we have got to proceed for calculation of the tax. I have already said that the tax is not going to be levied on the basis of the plug points which one may have in his house because plug points are taken into consideration for determination of the tariff. Since it is not the intention of Government to tax on the basis of the tariff, we will take the readings in the houses and tax on the basis of the meter readings and not the tariff.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—My point is not correctly understood. If the basis of the agreement between the licensee and the consumer itself is defective, what is the remedy open to the person aggrieved ? In his anxiety to get power an ordinary consumer is prepared to enter into any kind of agreement. Has the Electricity Board previously taken your approval to any kind of formula to be adopted between the consumer and itself ? This is all kept perpetually in doubt.

11 A.M.

SRI H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—No; it is the consumer's interest. If the formula is not convenient to him, it is for him to change. He must enter into a different formula.

SRI J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Where there is already penalisation on account of this agreement, you are going to penalise him further. Why not specify here in the appropriate section ? For example, sub-section (b) of section 3: I want to know to what cases this section applies. Supposing, amount is collected on the basis of power on bulbs, say of 40 watts or 60 watts. At the time of taking power I give you a figure and later on increase the capacity of bulbs; what is the remedy ?

SRI H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—In Bombay area, there is a practice of

basing the tariff on a flat rate. It is in order to provide for that, we have made a provision.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I want to tell the Hon'ble Minister in charge of this Bill that this particular sub-section (*b*) of section 2, will lead to complication in assessing the amount of energy consumed and even in the matter of recovery. Nobody seems to have understood a measure like this. Possibly it appears in some other State or in some other Bill and that has been incorporated here.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—It is in force.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Sri Kothavale, by his own experience, just now said that it was not working satisfactorily.

Then, coming to section 4 of the Bill, it is said:

> "Provided that where the licensee has been unable to recover the amounts due to him for the energy supplied by him he shall not be liable to pay the tax in respect of the energy so supplied."

Now, the Electricity Board is your Agent for the recovery of this taxation. This is the present position; is it not?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—There are other licensees also.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Now, you have made the Electricity Board your Agent. If they do not recover, they need not be made liable. Then, who is to come to the picture? In another section, it is said that it would be recovered as arrears of land revenue. You do not make one single agency responsible for the recovery. When once you make the Electricity Board responsible for the recovery of tax, it should be held responsible for the non-recovery of the tax. Supposing, more than 75 per cent is not recovered; as an alternative have you other agencies? Why not this be entrusted to the sales-tax people? Why do you want the Electricity Board? For the non-recovery of the tax, the Board is not made liable but it will be recovered through the process of Civil Court or as arrears of land revenue. Why this complicated procedure?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—My friend will agree to this simplest way in the matter of collecting tax because they are already at it. They collect tariff and the same agency can collect the taxes also more easily. If we have a different agency, we have to make different arrangements and it would be costly. Moreover, there is a certain amount of misapprehension that this clause intends to write off whenever the Board is unable to collect. It is not so. Where a person ones some amount to the Electricity Board and for reasons beyond one's control, he becomes insolvent and the amount could not be collected, it is only to meet such a contingency we have provided that clause. Where the agency is not able to collect tax in such a contingency, would it be fair on our part to make the Board liable for this?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Then I want to know how the amount of rebate you pay to the Electricity Board which shall not exceed 2 per cent of the taxes collected by it has been arrived at. You do not tell us the reason, Till now, this Electricity Board has been your agent for collection of takes, but you have not given them the cost of collection. When you ask the Board to do a job for you, you must pay them the cost of collection, let alone giving them any profit or any commission. Is this 2 per cent calculated on any basis? Have you consulted the Electricity Board whether this is sufficient for them to meet the cost of collection? Otherwise, this would be an arbitrary rate fixed.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—It is only an enabling clause. If, per chance, Government feels that a rebate is desirable, then it is open to Government to consult the Electricity Board, subject to a maximum fixed keeping in view the maximum collection.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Granting that you give 2 per cent; will it be sufficient?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—That will be taken into consideration.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Then, coming to the section relating to recoveries, as I already said, you must prevent litigation and prevent the consumers from getting into all these troubles. You could make it as land revenue demand; why should Government go to a Civil Court? This would mean engaging advocates, paying them fee and all that.

Coming to the section of exemption and reduction of tax, I want to know why Government have not given even a sample of cases in which they usually give either reduction or concession. This is an inherent defect of the Bill. I do not know what is behind this. You say, in every Bill there is the enabling clause. For example, there has been the agitation of the Chemicals and Fertilizers from quite a long time to give reduction in the case of energy supplied to them. There has been protracted correspondence. In some case, you give reduction even though there is no justification. Government should fromulate the well known and accepted basis for giving either reduction or concession. In the case of a person who does not consume more than half a H.P. and use it for industrial purpose, you may give him some concession. If you want small rural industries, small cottage industries, why not you say, up to 6 H.P. or 10 H.P. certain concession would be given. Suppose there is a press which utilises 100 horse power. Under the existing tariff rates it is Rs. 10 per horse power and now according to this Bill every month that particular press will have to pay Rs. 1,500, whether they utilise that energy or not. I am asking which industry would ever develop at the rate you contemplate of the levy of tax. On this tariff you are going to tax. Every pie is a burden on the consumer. Why are the consumers' interests not being guarded by the State which calls itself a welfare State? Can you ever expect a printing press or a press which is devoted to printing newspapers to bear this expenditure?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—It is not an individual case; any class of consumers.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Why not you mention it?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—It is to meet contingencies of the kind that the Hon'ble Member is suggesting, say power for irrigation, for domestic light or domestic heating. At present we do not intend giving any concession under that Clause, but at a later date if the House and the public opinion are in favour of such a thing, then it will be an enabling clause to help the Government to give exemptions or reductions for any particular class of consumers for specified purposes.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—The House is interested in trying to give power to the Ministry, but that power should be exercised reasonably, there should not be misuse of power. If you say publicly and in this Bill that you are going to give concessions and reductions in the matter of consumption of energy to small scale industries, medium industries and so on up to a maximum on power consumed, then it is quite fair. What is the difficulty in mentioning it either in the Schedule....

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—There is no difficulty. If the House feels at a later date that certain exemptions are to be given to certain class of consumers, then automatically even without an amendment the Government have power under this clause to give them reduction or exemption. Therefore it is only an enabling clause to implement the public view-point if that point appears to be reasonable.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Coming to clause 9 (2), you say—

> "Where an offence under sub-section (1) has been committed by a company, every person who, at the time the offence was committed, was in charge of, and was responsible to, the company for the conduct of the business of the company, as well as the company, shall be deemed to be guilty of the offence and shall be liable to be proceeded against and punished accordingly."

Supposing I happen to be the Director of a Company and there has been some default in regard to fulfilling the conditions contemplated in this Bill. I

represent the Company. I can understand your proceeding against the Company for recovering any amount or for the lapse in violation of the particular provision. Why do you make the individual and the Company both liable for this kind of lapse? Why have you introduced this personal liability also? Because at that rate I would not agree to associate myself with a Company.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—It is only just to help the man to be more cautious and to see that he does his duties properly without infringing any of the provisions.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—It is not fair. You can go on penalising the man. Supposing I am an honorary worker, as a Director of the Company. If this provision were to be there, what would be my position? I think it would be better that you proceed against the Company. After all, the person functions in a representative capacity. Supposing the Company is not in a position to compensate the loss or satisfactorily answer; then this man will be caught. You must think deeply and see that the person is exonerated. Being in a responsible position if he has bungled and if his *bona fides* are suspected, I can understand that. But if his *bona fides* are correct and you still insist that this man should be penalised, it is not correct.

Then I come to clause 10. I understand the Minister has already anticipated the objections whether it is valid to make a provision as in 10 (*d*). I am sure there is a Note from the Law Section. In that case I do not wish to waste the time. Is this in order? It is an extraordinary provision. If you say that it is in order and that it is upheld by the High Court, I do not wish to say anything.

Similarly, clause 14. Is there also a Note to justify what has been said in this Bill?

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Yes.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Very good. There is only one other matter to which I wish to refer. In respect of power for lift irrigation, I do not know if the Minister has bestowed time and thought upon it. There are a number of lines which have not been serviced. It is very unfair that people should be kept in a state of uncertainty and doubt. They say that the Government of India are not giving foreign exchange. You must find out whether in respect of the lines drawn, service is being given to potential consumers. You must see somehow that they get it. There are certain lines drawn for irrigation pumps. The lines have not been charged for want of meters. You may have a flat rate; you may exempt that at least from taxation if you like; that will be a class of cases coming under exemption clause.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—We will look into it.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I have no more remarks to offer except to suggest that it is better that you add a schedule in the matter of exemptions and reductions and if possible, I would like the Government to reduce the rate of taxation. Because it does work as a hardship. For example, a number of people, I understand, in Bombay Karnatak area are unwilling to take service and are reducing the number of lights, reducing the number of plug points and all that. The thing is, it will work as a very great hardship. In the ultimate analysis of the revenue that you expect, Rs. 52 lakhs will not be there; it may go down to Rs. 30 or 40 lakhs.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—On the other hand, the Bombay Karnatak people should be more happy because now in Bombay area it is 3.1 n.P. per unit and it will be now reduced to 2·1 n.P.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—Not the tariff.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The tariff has been made uniform. In the case of diesel power there is uniformity; in hydel supply there is uniformity. But as the Hon'ble Member knows, the cost of generating diesel power is much more than the cost of generating hydel power; can you advise Government, even suggest that it should be uniform both in respect of diesel and hydel power?

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—In respect of rates charged by the Board which manages diesel units there should be uniformity between that and those managed by private agencies.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—As the Hon'ble Member knows, we cannot make the rates uniform as between the diesel rates of the Mysore State Electricity Board and also the rates prescribed by the licensees baecuse those are guided and controlled by the contractors' obligations. The only way out is, as the Hon'ble Member suggested, nationalising power supply and taking over all those sets for Government. As I have already said, Government are bestowing thought over it and they are already preparing a Bill and it is likely that it will come in the course of this year or next year.

Sri J. B. MALLARADHYA.—I have no more remarks to offer.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ಗದಗ್ (ಗದಗ್).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಪತಿಗಳೇ, ಮಾನ್ಯ ಲೋಕೋಪಯೋಗಿ ಶಾಖಾ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮೈಸೂರು ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಸಂಬಂಧದ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳಗೊಂಡ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪಿಸಿ ಅವುಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬಯುಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಎರಡು ನಯಾಪೈಸದಿಂದ ಮೂರು ನಯಾಪೈಸಾಗಳವರೆಗೂ ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೆಲವು ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರು ನಯಾಪೈಸಾಗಳವರೆಗೂ ಇದ್ದದ್ದನ್ನು ಎನ್‌ಹ್ಯಾನ್ಸ್ ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು. ಈ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಮುಖ್ಯ ಅಂಶ ಇದೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನನ್ನ ವಾದ ಅಥವಾ ಬಿನ್ನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಡೈರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಆಗಿ ಕೊಡುವ ಪವರಿಗೆ ರೇಟ್ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಮತ್ತು ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸಿ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಕೊಡುವ ಪಕ್ಷಕ್ಕೆ ಆ ದರ ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ದರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ನಮ್ಮ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಣೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಏನು ಇತ್ತು ಎಂದರೆ ಇಡಿಯ ಪ್ರಾಂತದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೇ ಯೂನಿಫಾರಂ ರೇಟ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು. ರೀಆರ್ಗನೈಜೇಷನ್ ಆದಂದಿನಿಂದ ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾವು ವಿನಂತಿಯಿಂದ ಕೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೆವು. ತೀವ್ರ ಯೂನಿಫಾರಂ ರೇಟ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಆಶ್ವಾಸನವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದರು. ಆದರೆ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಮಾತ್ರ ಯೂನಿಫಾರಂ ಆಗಿದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ರೇಟ್ ಯೂನಿಫಾರಂ ಆಗುತ್ತಾ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಹೈಡಲ್ ಪವರ್ ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಸಪ್ಲೈ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೋ, ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿನಲ್ಲೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಹೈದರಾಬಾದಿನಲ್ಲೇ ಆಗಲಿ; ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲೇ ಆಗಲೀ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಒಂದೇ. ಡೀಜಿಲ್ ಸೆಟ್ಟಿನಿಂದ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸ್ಟೇಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಎಲ್ಲಿ ಸಪ್ಲೈಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೋ ಅದು ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಒಂದೇ. ಪವರ್ ಸಪ್ಲೈ ಮಾಡುವ ಪ್ರೈವೇಟ್ ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸಿಗೂ ನಮಗೂ ಒಪ್ಪಂದ ಇದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಯೂನಿಫಾರಂ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಬೇರೆ ಒಂದು ಲಾ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ನ್ಯಾಷನಲೈಜ್ ಮಾಡಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆಗಲೇ ತಿಳಿಸಿದ ಹಾಗೆ ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆಮಾಡಿ ಶಾಸನವನ್ನು ತಯಾರುಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತರುತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ. ಪಿ. ಗದಗ್.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದು ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಲೈಸನ್‌ಸೀಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಈಗ ವಸೂಲುಮಾಡುವ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಟ್ಯಾರಿಫ್‌ರೇಟಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಿದೆ. ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಮಹತ್ವದ್ದು ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ತಾವು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ಸಮರ್ಪಕ ಇರಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಎಷ್ಟಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಉದಾಹರಣೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ವಿವರಿಸಿ ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆ ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಮನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಏನು ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಪೂರೈಕೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿ ಬೋರ್ಡು ಹಾಕುವ ರೇಟು ಏನಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸಿ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಅದೇ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅದೇ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಇರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏನು ರೇಟು ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈಗ ಮನೆಗಳಿಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿ ಸಪ್ಲೈ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಔಟ್‌ಲೆಟ್ಟಿಗೂ ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೆ 26 ನಯಾ ಪೈಸಾದಂತೆ ಚಾರ್ಜ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. 12 ಔಟ್‌ಲೆಟ್ ಇವೆ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಒಂದು ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೆ 18 ಯೂನಿಟ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. 26 ನಯಾ ಪೈಸಾ ಟ್ಯಾರಿಫ್ ರೇಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ಎರಡು ನಯಾ ಪೈಸಾ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಎಂದರೆ ಒಟ್ಟು 28 ನಯಾ ಪೈಸೇ ಪರ್ ಯೂನಿಟ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗಾದರೆ 504 ನಯಾ ಪೈಸಾ ಅಥವಾ ಐದು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ನಾಲ್ಕು ನಯಾ ಪೈಸಾ ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಆ ತಿಂಗಳಿಗೆ ಚಾರ್ಜ್ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಲೈಸೆನ್ಸಿ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಪವರ್ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಬೀಳುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಒಂದು ಯೂನಿಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಆರು ಆಣೆಯಿಂದ ಒಂಬತ್ತು ಆಣೆಯವರೆಗೆ ಚಾರ್ಜ್ ಬೀಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಇನ್ನೂ ಕೆಲವು ಕಡೆ ಹತ್ತು ಆಣೆಯಂತೆ ಬೀಳುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಯೂನಿಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಹತ್ತು ಆಣೆಯಂತೆ ಲೆಕ್ಕ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಹತ್ತು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳವರೆಗೆ ಬೀಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಐದು ರೂಪಾಯಿ ನಾಲ್ಕು ನಯಾ ಪೈಸೆ ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ; ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ಹತ್ತು ರೂಪಾಯಿವರೆಗೆ ಬೀಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಎಂದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರಮಾಣದಲ್ಲಿ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದು ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ತರಹದಲ್ಲಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿರಿ. ಕಾಂಟ್ರಾಕ್ಟ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಕಾಂಪೆನ್‌ಸೇಷನ್ ಕೊಡಿರಿ. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ನ್ಯಾಷನಲೈಜ್ ಮಾಡಿರಿ. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಇಷ್ಟೆ. ನೀವು ಯಾವುದೇ ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿರಿ ಅದು ಯೂನಿಫಾರಂ ರೇಟ್ ಆಗುವುದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಿದೆ. ರೇಟಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಅಂತರ ಇದೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ವಿನಂತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಏನೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟದ್ದು ಇದೆ. ಉತ್ತರ ಕರ್ಣಾಟಕ ಮತ್ತು ಇತರ ಭಾಗಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಇರಬಹುದು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತೀವ್ರ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡುವರೆಂದು ನನ್ನ ನಂಬಿಕೆ ಮತ್ತು

ಆಶೆ. ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ತಕ್ಷಣ ಗಮನ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಯಾವ ಕೆಲಸವೇ ಇರಲಿ, ಯಾವ ಯೋಜನೆಯೇ ಇರಲಿ, ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳುವರೆಂದು ನಮ್ಮೆಲ್ಲರ ಮನವರಿಕೆ ಮತ್ತು ವಿಶ್ವಾಸ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ಈ ಬೇಡಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಬಲವಾದ ವ್ಯತ್ಯಾಸವನ್ನು ಹೋಗಲಾಡಿಸುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಅವಶ್ಯ ಇದೆ. ಬಹಳ ದಿವಸಗಳಿಂದ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆ ಈಡೇರಲಾರದೆ ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಉಳಿದಿದೆ. ನ್ಯಾಷನಲೈಜ್ ಮಾಡಿರಿ, ನೀವು ಯಾವ ಯೋಜನೆಯೇ ಮಾಡಿರಿ, ನಮಗೆ ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಯೂನಿಫಾರಂ ರೇಟ್ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಡೆಗೂ ಆಗಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ನಮಗೆ ಒಂದು ರೇಟು, ಮತ್ತೊಬ್ಬರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ರೇಟಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ, ಇದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಪುನಃ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ನ್ಯಾಷನಲೈಜ್‌ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಂದ ಅನೇಕ ರೆಪ್ರೆಜೆಂಟೇಷನ್ಸ್ ಮತ್ತು ಕಾನ್‌ಫರೆನ್ಸ್ ವಗೈರೆ ಆಗಿವೆ. ಕಾನ್‌ಫರೆನ್ಸ್ ಅನಾವರಣವನ್ನು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿಚಾರ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಯೂನಿಫಾರಂ ರೇಟು ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿಕೊಂಡು, ನನಗೆ ಭಾಷಣ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರಿಗೆ ಅಭಿವಂದನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಅರ್ಪಿಸಿ ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

11-30 A.M.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR (Belgaum City).—Sir, this Bill was first passed in the form of an Ordinance promulgated by the Governor. It was notified in the Gazette of 23rd June 1959 and came into force from 1st of July. Personally, I do not understand the necessity or the urgency that impelled Government to promulgate this ordinance, especially when this House was to have met next month. By passing such Ordinances, Government is laying down unhappy conventions.

I will now point out some of the defects in the Bill from the point of view of the consumers. I am pleading for the domestic consumers, particularly the smaller consumers, who are going to be hard-hit on account of this tax. In almost all the States where this tax has been levied, there are exemptions for smaller consumers, particularly for those who consume below 12 units of energy. But this Bill does not provide for such exemptions. In our area, the charges of electricity are very high already. For domestic purposes, we have to pay per unit 6, 7 or 8 annas. On account of this heavy cost of power, domestic consumers are compelled to restrict the use of power. I fully agree with the remarks of Sri Mallaradhya in this respect. Even the Taxation Enquiry Commission has recommended exemption for small consumers. It has stated "that the tax is not regressive because small consumers can be and are exempted." I request the Hon'ble Minister that he should make particular provision under the rules exempting the small consumers, particularly those consuming less than 12 units.

Concession in rates should also be shown to temples, mosques, charitable and educational institutions. We used to get that concession in the Bombay State and the same should be continued in this State also.

Specially low rates for cottage and small-scale industries should be provided for. The Taxation Enquiry Commission has rceommended low rates for small scale and cottage industries. They say:

> "Specially low rates for cottage and small scale industries in order that these may adapt themselves to methods of production that will result in greater productivity".

If concession is shown to small industries, it will give an impetus for production.

Sir, I would like to take this opportunity to ventilate the grievances of my constituency, *i.e.*, Belgaum town. The public here feel that the Government, particularly the Electricity Board, have failed to protect the consumers' interests. Belgaum gets electric supply from a private electricity concern, namely, the Amalgamated Electric Supply Co. This is a big concern, having power houses at several places in India. This concern is making huge profits from Belgaum so much so that they were able to make up the deficits they incurred in other power houses. The grievances of consumers are not looked into or redressed by the Electricity Board.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Hon'ble Member knows that the profit to be made by a private concern is limited under the Act itself.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—This company is exploiting the consumers of Belgaum in a number of ways. From time to time they try to enhance the rates unauthorisedly and illegally. Since 1st November 1958 the company has enhanced the rates of motive power by 50 per cent. They have also restricted the hours of energy supply from 6 to 10 P.M.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—How is this relevant to the Bill? Hon'ble Member may plead that there should be no taxes at all. But can the activities of the company be discussed here now?

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I will not get another opportunity to ventilate the grievances of the people. I am trying to point out that neither the Government nor the Electricity Board has come to the rescue of the people. Belgaum town is particularly affected. Small scale industries are handicapped. There are so many grievances against this company. It is unfortunate that the consumer class is perhaps the most unprotected class in this country. While workers can organise themselves into Trade Unions, peasants organise themselves into Kisan Sabhas, the consumer class is so scattered, dispersed and atomised that it is difficult to get them organised. That is why the consumer class is left to the winds. But on account of the harassment of the company, the consumers in my town have organised themselves into an organisation called the Consumers' Association. Several representations have been made to the Government and to the Electricity Board stating the grievances against the company. But I regret to say that cold shoulders were shown to these representations. The letters were not replied to nor even acknowledged. At long last after repeated representations the Electricity Board asked the Consumers' Organisation to seek relief in law courts. Instead of interfering and inquiring into the matter, the Electricity Board showed the Consumers' Organisation the doors of law courts.

One particular grievance against the Belgaum company is that they have enhanced the rates by 50 per cent from the 1st of November 1958 and restricted the hours of supply. The consumers' contention was that that enhancement of rate as well as the restriction of hours ere illegal and unauthorised and they approached the Electricity Board requesting them to enquire into the matter and appoint a Rating Committee. Under section 57 of the Electricity Act the Electricity Board is required to appoint a, Rating Committee in such cases of dispute. Instead of appointing a Rating Committee the Electricity Board directed the Consumers' Organisation to go to law courts. Then the Consumers' Organisation filed a suit in the court of the Civil Judge at Belgaum, and the Judge gave a decision in favour of the consumers. The Judge has remarked in the course of the judgment that "a great responsibility lies on the State Government to watch the interest of the consumers whenever revising the rates". He also holds that the enhancement of rate is unauthorised and illegal. In the final order he says that "the defendant is restrained from recovering excess charges in contravention of this order of the Bombay State. The defendant is also restrained from not supplying energy to the consumers like the paintiffs between 6 P.M. and 10 A.M." So, the consumers in order to get redress, had to approach the court.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I would like to suggest to the Hon'ble Member to make comments on the provisions of this Bill and not make this a forum for ventilating the grievances of the consumers in places where power is supplied by licensees. I would be grateful if he says what he feels on the merits and demerits of the Bill before us.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY (Mysore).—The Hon'ble Member says that when we have failed to safeguard the interests of the consumers we have no right to tax them.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—This Government has failed to safeguard the interests of the consumers.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—You took a tip from the Hon'ble Member Sri Puttaswamy!

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—Sir, I wish to read an extract from the speech of Hon'ble Sri Nanda in Lok Sabha on 14th August 1956 when the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948, was amended. Hon'ble Sri Nanda declared as follows:

> "The understanding or the assumption is that the Government function on behalf of the consumers. If a considerable number of consumers have represented to the Government that the rates are too high, then Government will certainly have the power to appoint a Rating Committee."

So according to him, it is the responsibility of the Government to appoint a Rating Committee when there is a dispute regarding rates.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—We are all guided by the Act in force.

Sri B. R. SUNTHANKAR.—I would finally request the Government, particularly the Electricity Board, that they should enquire into the complaints and allegations made by the consumers of Belgaum and to appoint a Rating Committee as early as possible.

With this request I conclude my speech.

[MR. SPEAKER in the Chair]

†ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ (ಗುಬ್ಬಿ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ಮನಃಪೂರ್ವಕವಾಗಿ ವಿರೋಧ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಎಂಬ ಈ ಬಿಳಿಯ ಆನೆಯನ್ನು ಸಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳಾದ ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಇ ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟರಿಂದ ಹಿಡಿದು ಚೀಫ್ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್‌ವರೆಗೂ ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಓಡಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರು ಬೇಕು. ಈ ಭೋಗಗಳನ್ನು ಅನುಭವಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ... ...

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Money does not go to the Electricity Board, it goes to the Exchequer.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—On the other hand they will take money from you.

ಇದನ್ನು ಏಕೆ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆಂದರೆ ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಡಿ, energy ಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಬೇಡಿ ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲು ಇಂಥ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ತಂದರೆ ಜನಗಳು ತಮಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯುತ್ತು ಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುವುದನ್ನು ಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ulterior motive. ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಕೇಳಿದರೆ, ಅಷ್ಟು ದುಡ್ಡು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದ ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿ ಬೇಡ, ನಾವು ಎಣ್ಣೆ ದೀಪವನ್ನು ಉರಿಸುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಜನಗಳು ಹೇಳಲಿ ಎಂಬುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಇಚ್ಛೆ ಎಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ, ಯಾವುದಕ್ಕೂ ರಾಜಕೀಯವಿದೆ; ರಾಜಕೀಯದ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿ ಇದೆ ಅಂಥಾದ್ದನ್ನು ವಿಚಾರ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಕಣ್ಣು ತೆರೆದು ನೋಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಆದರೆ ಇಂಥ ವಿಷಯ ಬಂದಾಗ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಷ್ಟ. ಸೇಲ್ಸ್ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್, ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್ಚರಲ್ ಇನ್‌ಕಂಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಮುಂತಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕಾನೂನು ಬರುತ್ತದೆಂದರೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಜನ ಗುಜುಗುಂಪಲು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇಂಥ ಟೆಕ್ನಿಕಲ್ ಪಾಯಿಂಟ್, ಒಂದು ತಿಳಿಯದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ವಿಷಯದಮೇಲೆ ಕಾನೂನು ಬಂದರೆ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಮರೆವು ಜಾಸ್ತಿ. They do not bestow their thought on these matters. ಇಂತಹದರಮೇಲೆ ನಾವು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಹಾಕಬಹುದೆಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗಲಿ, ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೇ ಆಗಲಿ, ಜನಗಳಿಗೇ ಆಗಲಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ದೀಪವಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಉರಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ, ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೆರಡು ವಾಲ್‌ಪ್ಲಗ್ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಲಿ, ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸದೆ ಇರಲಿ, ಅವುಗಳಿಗೆ flat rate ಹಾಕಿ, ಮಿನಿಮಂ ಚಾರ್ಜ್ ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದರೆ, indirectly they are asking people not to demand electricity. ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆನ್ನುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಇಚ್ಛೆಯಾದರೆ, ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕು. ಜನಗಳ ಅಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ಅಗತ್ಯವಾದ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಹೀಗೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ಏನೇನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರೋ ಅದರಿಂದ ಪರೋಕ್ಷವಾಗಿ ಜನತೆ ಹೊರಲಾರದಷ್ಟು ಹೊರೆಯನ್ನು ಹೊರುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಈ ನೀತಿ ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಇದನ್ನು ಬಹಳ ವೇಗದಿಂದ ಅವಸರವಸರವಾಗಿ ತರಬಾರದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಬಡ್ಜೆಟ್ ಅಧಿವೇಶನದಲ್ಲಿ ತರಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರುವಂಥ ವೇಳೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಜನ ಎಚ್ಚತ್ತುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ವಿಧಾನಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೊರಟಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮನೋಭಾವ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಇಚ್ಛೆ consumerಗೆ ವಿರೋಧವಾಗಿದೆ, ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರ ಕಡೆಗೆ ವಾಲಿದೆ ಎಂದರೆ ತಪ್ಪಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಿಂದ ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರಿಗೆ ಬಹಳ ಉಪಯೋಗ ಉಂಟು. ಈ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸಿನ ಹೊರೆ ಬಡವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಬೀಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಟಿಂಗ್ ಸರ್ಕ್ಯೂಟ್ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು, ಒಂದೊಂದು ದೀಪ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡರೂ ಎಷ್ಟೋ ಹೊರೆ ಬೀಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಬೋರಣ್ಣಗೌಡರು ರೈಸ್‌ಮಿಲ್ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಇನ್ನೂ ರೇಟ್ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಂತೋಷವಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಆಯಿಲ್ ಮಿಲ್, ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಲರ್ಸ್, ಸಿನಿಮಾ ಮತ್ತು ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಮಿಲ್ಲುಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರುವವರ ಮೇಲೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಹಾಕಲಿ. ಅವರು ಹೇಗೋ ಹಣ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ, ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸನ್ನೂ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹಳ್ಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ದೀಪ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೂ, ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಿಂದ ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಆತಂಕ ತಂದಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಈ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸಿನ ನೆಪದಲ್ಲಿ ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿಗಾಗಿ ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ಕೇಳಬೇಡಿ ಎಂದು ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದು ಒಂದು ಮಾರ್ಗ.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I have already made it clear that where plugs are put in, the taxation will be only in respect of the actual energy that is consumed and there is no point in saying it over and over again.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—When my Hon'ble frend Sri Channabasappa was sitting here, he used to tell me so many things about mismanagement by the Electricity Department and the Electricity Board and how peope were harassed. I think that because he is now in the Ministry he wants to defend all their actions. ನಿಮಗೆ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಕಾಯಿದೆ ಒಂದು ಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ. ಮಿಕ್ಕದ್ದರಲ್ಲಿ ದೇಶ ಪ್ರೇಮ ಎಳ್ಳಷ್ಟೂ ಕಡಮೆ ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ತಾವು ಇವೊತ್ತಿನ ದಿವಸ ಬಡವರಮೇಲೆ ಇಷ್ಟು ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸು ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ಸರ್ವಥಾ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದಲ್ಲ. ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ವಿಶ್ವಾಮಿತ್ರ, ನಕ್ಷತ್ರಕರಿಗಿಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ನಿಗಾ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ನಕ್ಷತ್ರಕ ಹರಿಶ್ಚಂದ್ರನಿಂದ ಸಾಲ ವಸೂಲುಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಅವನಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಅಭಿಮಾನವಾದರೂ ಇತ್ತು. ಇಲ್ಲಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ, ಕಾಲವಿಳಂಬವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೇಗೆ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದರಲ್ಲಿ, ಬಹುದೂರ ಹೋಗಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಜನಗಳಿಂದ ಹಣ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟೆಲ್ಲಾ ಮುತುವರ್ಜಿ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರೂ, ಲೈನುಗಳು ಕೆಟ್ಟುಹೋಗಿ, ದೊಡ್ಡದೊಡ್ಡ ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳಾದ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಮೈಸೂರುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹಿತ ಕರೆಂಟು ನಿಂತುಹೋದಾಗ, ದೀಪಗಳು ಮಂಕಾದಾಗ, ಇದರಿಂದ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾದಾಗ, ಯಾವ ವ್ಯವಧಾನವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸುತ್ತೀರೆಂದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಕಾನೂನಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲ. ನೋಡಿ ಹೇಗಿದೆ. ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿ ಫೇಲ್ ಆದರೆ, it is beyond anybody's control, ಏನು ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಯಾವ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ತಾವು ಜನಗಳಮೇಲೆ ಸುಂಕ ಹಾಕಿ ವಸೂಲು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೀರೋ, ಅದೇರೀತಿ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಕೊಡುವ ದಾರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾವು ನಿಜವಾಗಿ ಫೇಲಾಗಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಡಿಫೆಕ್ಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಸರಿಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

ನಿಮ್ಮ memorandum regarding delegated legislation ನನಗಂತೂ ಅರ್ಥವಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. Clause 8 empowers the State Government to notify exemptions and reductions of tax. ಈ ಕ್ಲಾಸನ್ನು ಯಾವ ಆಧಾರದಮೇಲೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ? ಇದು ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಮತ್ತು ಯಾರಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ? ರಹಸ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಯಾರಿಗೆ exemption or reduction in rate of the tax ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇದನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ ? ನಾಳೆ ಬೆಳಗ್ಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಎ.ಐ.ಸಿ.ಸಿ. ಮಹಾಧಿವೇಶನವನ್ನು ಕರೆಯಲಿದೆ. ಸಾವಿರಾರು ಯೂನಿಟ್ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಲಿದೆ. ಆಗ ಅದನ್ನು ಕಡಮೆಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಪವರ್ ಇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಎಕ್ಸೆಂಷನ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸನ್ನು ಇಂಟ್ರೊಡ್ಯೂಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದೀರ ?

ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಇವೊತ್ತು ಪತ್ರಿಕೋದ್ಯೋಗವನ್ನು ಅವಲಂಬಿಸಿರುವ ಕೆಲವರು ಅವರ ಉದ್ಯೋಗಗಳನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸಿಬಿಡುತ್ತಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಅರ್ಥಬರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಯಾವ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮಾಲಿಕನೂ ಆದಾಯ ಬರದಿದ್ದರೆ 100 ಅಶ್ವಶಕ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಮೋಟಾರನ್ನು ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಾಲ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರು ಹೇಳಿದುದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಒಪ್ಪುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧನಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಪೇಪರ್ ಪ್ರೆಸ್‌ಗಾಗಲಿ, ಕ್ಲಾತ್ ಮಿಲ್ಲಿಗಾಗಲಿ, ಸಿಲ್ಕ್ ಫ್ಯಾಕ್ಟರಿಗಾಗಲಿ, ಎಕ್ಸ್‌ಪೆಲ್ಲರಿಗಾಗಲಿ, ರೈಸ್ ಮಿಲ್ಲಿಗಾಗಲಿ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಲಿ ಎಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವುಗಳ ಮಾಲಕರು ಆದಾಯವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ರನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಲಾಭದಾಯಕವಾಗಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಆ ಕನ್‌ಸರ್ನ್‌ಗಳನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೆಯೇ ? ಮತ್ತೆ ಎಕ್ಸೆಂಷನ್ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರಿ ? ನಾಳೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದವರು ಪ್ರೆಸ್ ನಡೆಸಿದರೆ, ಅವರು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಆರ್ಗನ್ ನಡೆಸಿ, ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ, ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ವಿಚಕ್ಷಣೆಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ, ಅಂಥವರ ಉಪಯೋಗಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈ ಕ್ಲಾಸನ್ನು ತಾವು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೀರೆಂದು ನನಗನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಎಕ್ಸೆಂಷನ್ ಕ್ಲಾಸನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಡಿ ; ಬಿಟ್ಟುಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಹಣ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ನಿಮಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಬಡವನ ಮೇಲೆ ಕರುಣೆ. ಆದರೂ ಅವನಿಂದ ಹಣಗಳಿಸಬೇಕು. ಒಂದು ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೊಡು ಅಂದರೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ತಾ ಎನ್ನುತ್ತೀರಿ. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾದ ಮಾರ್ಗವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು, ಜನತೆಗೆ ಸಮಾಧಾನವಾಗುವಂಥ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ, ನಿಮಗೆ ತೃಪ್ತಿಯಾಗುವಂಥ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಒಂದು ಕಣ್ಣಿಗೆ ಸುಣ್ಣ, ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಕಣ್ಣಿಗೆ ಬೆಣ್ಣೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾನೂನು ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು ಈಗಲಾದರೂ ಬಿಡಲಿ ಎಂದು ನಾನು ವಿನಯದಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥನೆಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಕ್ಲಾಸ್ 10ರಲ್ಲಿ :

"The State Government may, by notification, make rules to carry out the purpose of this Act"

ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಮೆಮೊರ್ಯಾಂಡಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ :

"The matters in respect of which rules have to be made are of a procedural and routine character. Clause 14 empowers the State Government to make orders for remaining difficulties arising in giving effect to the provisions of the proposed enactment."

ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಅವರಿಗೇ ಕೊಟ್ಟುಬಿಡಿ. ಆಮೇಲೆ ಈ ಸಭೆಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಗೆ ಎಂದು ತಂದುಬಿಡಿ. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥದ್ದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ, ಏನು ಏನು ಉಪಕಾರ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೋ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾಡಿ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಆ ವಿಷಯಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತವೆ. ಇದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಯಾರಿಗಾದರೂ ಎಕ್ಸೆಂಪ್ಷನ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕು, ಯಾರಿಗಾದರೂ ರಿಡಕ್ಷನ್ ತೋರಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕಂಡರೆ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಮಾಡಿ.

ನಿನ್ನೆಯದಿನ ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದ ಮಾದಪ್ಪನವರು ಈಗ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಈ ಸಣ್ಣ ಮಸೂದೆಯಿಂದ ತಾವು ಎಷ್ಟು ರೆವಿನ್ಯೂ ನಿರೀಕ್ಷಿಸಿದ್ದೀರಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರು. ತಾವು ಉತ್ತರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಅದನ್ನು ರಹಸ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಪೆಕ್ಟಿಂಗ್ ಆಫೀಸರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಆಣೆ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಅವರ ಸ್ಟೇಟಸ್ ಹೇಗಿದೆ, ಮಣ್ಣುಮಸಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ನೀವು ನಿಜವಾಗಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಜನತೆಗೆ ಏನು ಏನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೊರಟಿದ್ದೀರೋ, ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತೀರ? ಹೊಸ ಬೋರ್ಡು ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಟ್ ಆಗುವವರೆಗೆ ಇದನ್ನು ತಡೆದಿದ್ದರೆ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿತ್ತು. ರಿಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಟ್ ಆದಮೇಲೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಲೋಪದೋಷಗಳೇನು ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು, ಅವುಗಳಮೇಲೆ ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಅಡ್‌ವೈಸ್ ಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ, ಜನತೆಗೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಅನುಕೂಲವೇನು, ಅನಾನುಕೂಲವೇನು ಎಂದು ಯೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ, ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತರಬಹುದಾಗಿತ್ತು.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The notifications are published in the *Mysore Gazette*. I thought the Hon'ble Member knew it. If he has not seen it, I invite his attention to the notification issued by Government on the 30th June 1959.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ನೀವು ನನಗೆ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಕೂಡ, ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಲಿ ಪೆಟ್ಟು ಶ್ರೀಮಂತರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇದರಿಂದ ಅನುಕೂಲವಿದೆ. ಬಡವರು ಒಂದು ದೀಪ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ಮದುವೆ ಮುಂಜಿಗೆ ಲೌಡ್ ಸ್ಪೀಕರ್ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು, ನಾಲ್ಕು ದೀಪಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ, ಹಾಕಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೋ, ಬಿಡಬೇಕೋ? ಇದರಿಂದ ಅಗ್ರಿಕಲ್‌ಚರಿಗೋಸ್ಕರ ಪಂಪ್ ಪಡೆಯಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಕಷ್ಟ. ಏತಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಆತುರ ಆತುರವಾಗಿ ಇವೊತ್ತು, ಕೊನೆಯದಿವಸ, ತಂದಿದ್ದೀರಿ? ಇದನ್ನು ಪಾಸ್ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ, ಮತ್ತೊಮ್ಮೆ ಸೇರುತ್ತೇವಲ್ಲಾ ಆವಾಗ ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸೋಣ; ಪುನಃ ನಾವು ಸೇರುವವರೆಗೂ ಇದನ್ನು ಹಿಡಿದಿಡಿ. ಇವೊತ್ತು ಇದನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿಲ್ಲ. ಇಂಥ ಘನ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಹಾರಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಇಂತಹ ಮಸೂದೆಗಳನ್ನು ಅವಸರವಸರವಾಗಿ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ತಾರದೆ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಕಾಲಾವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಜನಾಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಏನಿದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಪಾಸುಮಾಡುವುದು ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು, ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಶ್ರೀ ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪನವರು ರೈತರ ಮಗ ಇದ್ದಾರೆಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ನೇಗಿಲ ಒಡೆಯ ಎಂದು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡು ಅವರು ತಂದಿರುವ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ನನ್ನ ವಿರೋಧವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿ ಇದರಿಂದ ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗದೆ ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ನಂಬಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ನಿಲ್ಲಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

12 NOON.

†ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹಲವು ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಬಹಳ ರಚನಾತ್ಮಕವಾದ ಕೆಲವು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಅನುಮಾನಾಸ್ಪದವಾದ ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿ ತೋರಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಅನುಮಾನಗಳನ್ನು ಪರಿಹಾರಮಾಡುವುದು ನನ್ನ ಕರ್ತವ್ಯ. ಕೆಲವರು ಈ ಶಾಸನ ರಾಜ್ಯಾಂಗಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರುದ್ಧವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಸೂಚನೆಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮೊಟ್ಟಮೊದಲನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸನ್ನು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಡಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು, ಶಾಸನವಾಗಿ ತರಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು, ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿ ನಮಗೆ ಇದ್ದಂಥ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಿತ್ತುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂದು ಉಜ್ವಲವಾಗಿ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಒಬ್ಬೊಬ್ಬರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದರು. ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆಯದೆ ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕ ಆಶೆ ನಮಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಪಡೆದು ಶಾಸನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ತಮಗೆಷ್ಟು ಅಭಿಮಾನ ಇದೆಯೋ ನಮಗೂ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ಅಭಿಮಾನ, ಪ್ರೀತಿ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಶಾಸನವನ್ನು ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ತರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಅನೇಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳು ಇವೆ. ದೇಶದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಶಾಸನ ಸಭೆ ಕೂಡದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಶಾಸನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ, ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಮಾಡಲೇಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೆಹೋದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ದೇಶಕ್ಕೆ ಹಿತ ಎಂದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದಾಗ ನೀವು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಸಭೆ ಸೇರುವವರೆಗೆ ಕಾಯಬೇಕಾಗಿತ್ತು ನಿಮಗೆ ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಹೊರಡಿಸುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ, ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿ ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ತಾವೇ ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಿರಿ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಬಿ. ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ.—ನಾವು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಸಮಯ ಬಂದಂತೆ ವಾದಮಾಡುವುದು ಬೇಡಿ. ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಅದರ ಯೋಗ್ಯತೆ ಮತ್ತು ಅಯೋಗ್ಯತೆಯನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲಿಸೋಣ. ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ನಾವು ಈ ಶಾಸನವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳೋಣ. ಟ್ಯಾರೀಫ್ ಸ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಚರ್ ಫೈನಲೈಸ್‌ಮಾಡಿ ಒಂದು ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದರೆ ಆಗ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಎಲೆಕ್ಟ್ರಿಸಿಟಿಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಒಂದು ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಹಾಕಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಗ ಒಂದು ಕಡೆ ಒಂದು ತರಹ, ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಕಡೆ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ತರಹ ಆಗಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿ ಬಂದು ಮತ್ತೆ ಕೆಲವರು ಕಡಮೆ ಕೊಡುವ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಬರುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಆದರಿಂದ ಜನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯ ಅಸಮಾಧಾನವಾಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಬಹಳಕಾಲದಿಂದ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಯೂನಿಫಾರಂ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೆವು. ಟ್ಯಾರೀಫ್ ಸ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಚರ್ ಫೈನಲೈಜ್‌ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲಿಯ ತನಕ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಫೈನಲೈಜ್‌ಮಾಡಲಾಯಿತು. ನಾಲ್ಕಾರು ದಿವಸಗಳು ಮತ್ತೆ ತಡಮಾಡಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದರಿಂದ ಅತೃಪ್ತಿ ಆಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ ಕಡಮೆ ಆಗುತ್ತಿತ್ತು. ಟ್ಯಾರೀಫ್‌ಸ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಚರ್ ಫೈನಲೈಸ್‌ಮಾಡಿ ಆರ್ಡರ್ ಕೊಟ್ಟ ದಿವಸವೇ ಏಕಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಟ್ಯಾರೀಫ್ ಸ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಚರ್ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಯೂನಿಫಾರಂ ಆಗಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ, ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅದು ಅವಶ್ಯಕ ಎಂದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತರಬೇಕಾಯಿತು. ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳದೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಹಕ್ಕು ಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದು ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಹೊರಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಇಲ್ಲ. ಅನು

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ)

ಮಾನ ತಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದರೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ದಯವಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಬಿಡಿ. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಯೂನಿಫಾರಂ ಟ್ಯಾರಿಫ್ ಸ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಚರ್, ಯೂನಿಫಾರಂ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಸ್ಟ್ರಕ್ಚರ್ ಆಗಬೇಕು.

ಎರಡನೆಯದು ನಾವು ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಶಾಸನವನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರಿಸಿದ್ದರೆ, ಹೈದರಾಬಾದ್‌ನವರು ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಕೊಡದೆ ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಮಾಡುವುದು, ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿನವರು ಕಡಮೆ ಹಣ ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಅದೇ ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿ ಉಪಯೋಗಮಾಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕೊಡತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಿರಿ. ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಹೊರಡಿಸದೆ ಲೋಪಮಾಡಿದ್ದಲ್ಲ, ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಆ ದಿವಸ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಡಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ ನಿಮ್ಮದು ತಪ್ಪು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದಿರಿ. ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಇದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿಮಾಡಿದ್ದು ಸರಿ ಎಂದು. ಆದರೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ವಾದ ಹಾಕಬೇಕು, ವಿರೋಧವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಬಿಲ್ಲು ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಪಾಸುಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವ ಮನೋಭಾವದಿಂದ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರೇ ವಿನಾ, ವಾಸ್ತವವಾಗಿ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ಈ ಶಾಸನಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಂತರಂಗವನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—May I know the instrument for finding it out?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಮಾತನಾಡತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಹಾವ, ಭಾವ, ಥಾಟಿನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್‌ಮಾಡಿದಮೇಲೆ ಇದೇ ಮೊಟ್ಟಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಸಭೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಈ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಸಿಸ್ಟಂನಿಂದ ಬಡವರಿಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಅದನ್ನು ವಜಾಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಶ್ರೀ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಬಡವರಿಗೂ ತೊಂದರೆ ತಪ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕು. ಪುಣ್ಯವಂತರಾಗಿರುವವರಿಗೂ ತೊಂದರೆಯನ್ನು ತಪ್ಪಿಸಬೇಕು. ಯಾರು ಸೌಖ್ಯವನ್ನ ಪಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅವರು ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚುಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಬಡವರೂ ಉಪಯೋಗಮಾಡುತ್ತಿರಲಿ. ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಉಪಯೋಗಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ? ಬಡವರು ಉಪಯೋಗಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆಯೇ? ಇಲ್ಲ. ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಪ್ರಗತಿಪರಕಾರ್ಯಗಳೂ ನೀರಾವರಿ ಸೌಕರ್ಯಗಳೂ ಆಗಬೇಕು. ರಸ್ತೆಗಳು ಆಗಬೇಕು. ಕುಡಿಯುವ ನೀರಿನ ಸೌಕರ್ಯ ಆಗಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗೆ ದೇಶಾಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಯ ಅನೇಕ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣಬೇಕು. ಮಾಯಾ ಮಂತ್ರ ಮಾಡಿ ಹಣ ಸಂಪಾದನೆಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಕಲಿಸಿಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್‌ವಜಾಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ. ಈ ಕೆಲಸ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ, ಆ ಕೆಲಸ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಲಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತಾ, ಇರುವಾಗ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸೇಷನ್ ಮೆಷರ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ? ಅನುಕೂಲಗಳು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಆಗಬೇಕು. ಮಣ್ಣಿನ ರಸ್ತೆ ಇದ್ದುದು ಜೆಲ್ಲಿ ರಸ್ತೆ ಆಗಬೇಕು. ಜೆಲ್ಲಿ ರಸ್ತೆ ಇದ್ದುದು ಸಿಮೆಂಟ್ ರಸ್ತೆ ಆಗಬೇಕು. ಆ ಮೇಲೆ ವಿಮಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ತಿರುಗಾಡಲು ವಿಮಾನ ನಿಲ್ದಾಣ ಆಗಬೇಕು. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಆಶೆ ಆಕಾಂಕ್ಷೆಗಳನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರುವಾಗ ಯಾರು ಯಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇದೆಯೋ ಅವರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ರಾಷ್ಟ್ರದ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಬಡವರನ್ನು ಮೇಲಕ್ಕೆ ಎತ್ತುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ವಾತಾವರಣವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪನೆಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಲೇಬೇಕು. ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ತೆರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕೋ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹಾಕಲೇಬೇಕು. ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸೇಷನ್ ನಾವು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಹಾಕಿಲ್ಲ. ವಾದಮಾಡಿದ್ದದನ್ನು ಕೇಳಿ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೇವೆಂದು ನನಗೆ ಅನ್ನಿಸಿತು. ಆದರೆ ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿನಲ್ಲದೆ, ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲದೆ, ಮದ್ರಾಸಿನಲ್ಲದೆ, ಕೊಡಗಿನಲ್ಲದೆ, ಹೈದರಾಬಾದು ಒಂದರಲ್ಲೇ ಇರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗಿದೆಯೋ ಅಲ್ಲಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಎಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಿ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಅಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಹಾಕಿ ಎಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಒಂದೇ ಸಮನಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇದು ನ್ಯಾಯ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ವಿರೋಧಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಒಪ್ಪದೆ ಇರಲಾರರು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ನ್ಯಾಯವಾದುದನ್ನು ನ್ಯಾಯವೆಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೀರೆಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಈ ಆರ್ಡಿನೆನ್ಸ್ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದ್ದು ನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರ ಹಿತದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಸರ್ವರಿಗೂ ನ್ಯಾಯ ದೊರೆಯುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಸರಿ. ಇದೇನು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದರಿಂದ ಹಿಂದೆ ಇದ್ದಂಥ ಕಷ್ಟಕ್ಕಿಂತ ಏನೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ನಾನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದೆ, ಹಿಂದೆ ಒಂದು ಯೂನಿಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಎರಡು ನಯಾ ಪೈಸೆ ಇತ್ತು. ಅದೇ ಮ್ಯಾಗ್ಜಿಮಂ. ಇವತ್ತು ತೆರಿಗೆಯ ಸ್ಟ್ರಕ್‌ಚರ್ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ನೋಟಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಓದಿದರೆ ತಮಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ನಾನು ಭಾವಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಯಾವ ಯಾವ ಬಾಬಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ದರವಿದೆ ಎನ್ನತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ನೋಟಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ನಿನಿಂದ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ಜುಲೈ 1ನೆಯ ತಾರೀಖಿನಿಂದ ಹೊರಡಿಸಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಆ ನೋಟಿಫಿಕೇಷನ್ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ. ಏಳು ನಯಾ ಪೈಸೆಯಿಂದ ಹಿಡಿದು ಎರಡು ನಯಾ ಪೈಸೆಯವರೆಗೆ ಈಗ ಹಾಕಿದ್ದೇವಷ್ಟೆ. ಮೂರು ನಯಾ ಪೈಸೆ ಏತಕ್ಕೆ ಇಡಬೇಕು ಎನ್ನುವುದು ತಮಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಗೊತ್ತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಅದೇನೂ ಹೊಸದಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಈಚೆಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿಯ ಬಳಕೆಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಹೊಸ ಹೊಸ ತೆರಿಗೆಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅನಿವಾರ್ಯವೆನ್ನುವುದನ್ನು ತಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಪದೇ ಪದೇ ಇಂತಹ ಹೊಸ ಹೊಸ ಮಸೂದೆಗಳನ್ನು ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲು ಅವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂದ ಕಂಡುಬಂದರೆ ಆಗ ತೆರಿಗೆಯನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಸಲು ಈ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆಯೇ ವಿನಾ ಮತ್ತೆ ಬೇರೆ ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ತಮಗೆ ಅನುಮಾನವಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಫೈನಾನ್ಶಿಯಲ್ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಏಕೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಆಕ್ಷೇಪಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಕಾನ್ಸ್‌ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್ನಿನ 168ನೆಯ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಾವು ಪದೇ ಪದೇ ಕನ್‌ಸಾಲಿಡೇಟೆಡ್ ಫಂಡಿನಿಂದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡುವ ಪ್ರಮೇಯವಿದ್ದರೆ ಆಗ ಫೈನಾನ್ಶಿಯಲ್ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ವಿನಾ, ಆ ಪ್ರಮೇಯವಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಈ ಫೈನಾನ್ಶಿಯಲ್ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಕೊಡುವುದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂದು ಮತ್ತೆ ಮತ್ತೆ ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿರುತ್ತದೆ. ತಾವು ನಮ್ಮನ್ನು ಪ್ರಶಂಸೆಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಫೈನಾನ್ಶಿಯಲ್ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್‌ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದು ಅದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಆಣೆಯನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿಲ್ಲ.

ಮತ್ತೆ ಎರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಎತ್ತಿದರು. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ 10ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜು 2 (*d*) ನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಿದೆ:

"Providing for any other matter for which there is no provision or insufficient provision in this Act and for which provision is, in the opinion of the State Government, necessary for giving effect to the provisions of this Act."

ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ರೂಲನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ಅದು ಅಲ್ಟ್ರಾವೈರ್ಸ್, ಅನ್‌ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನಲ್ ಎಂದು ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ನಮ್ಮ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರು ಬಹಳ ಬುದ್ಧಿವಂತರು. ನನ್ನ ಟೇಬಲ್‌ಮೇಲೆ ಇದ್ದ ಪುಸ್ತಕಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದ್ದಿದ್ದರೆ, ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನೇ ಎತ್ತುತ್ತಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಥಾರಿಟಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ ಎನ್ನುವ ಅರಿವು ಸೂಕ್ಷ್ಮ ಬುದ್ಧಿಯುಳ್ಳಂಥ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯ ಅಂತಹವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. 1956ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಯ A. I. R. Madras 659—ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮದ್ರಾಸ್ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೂ ಮತ್ತು ಲೂಯಿಸ್ ಡ್ರೇಫಸ್ ಅಂಡ್ ಕಂಪೆನಿ ಲಿಮಿಟೆಡ್ ಎಂಬುವರಿಗೆ ವಾದ ಬಂದಾಗ, it is a Full Bench decision of the Madras High Court reported in A.I.R. Madras 659. ನನಗೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಓದಬೇಕಾದುದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂದು ತೋರುತ್ತದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಕಾಲ ವೃಥಾ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅವರು ಒಂದು ತೀರ್ಮಾನವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ಮಾಡುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನೂ ಅಭ್ಯಂತರವಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

Sri Y. VEERAPPA (Holenarasipur).—I want the Hon'ble Minister to read the operative portion.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಗುರುತು ಹಾಕಿ ರೆಡಿಮಾಡಿ ಇಟ್ಟಿದೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—If so, the Minister may pass it on to the Hon'ble Member. ನೀವೂ ಲಾಯರಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಶಯ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಇನ್ನು ಕ್ಲಾಜ್ 14 Power to remove difficulties. ಈ ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ಕೂಡ ಅನ್‌ಕಾನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನಲ್ ಆಗಿದೆ ಎಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿತ್ತು. ಅದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ. ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಶಾಸನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದರೆ Mysore Motor Spirit Taxation Act, 1957, Agricultural Income-tax Act of 1957, Mysore Sales tax Act of 1957—ಇವುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಇಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಅವನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈ ಸಭೆ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇದು ಈ ಶಾಸನಕ್ಕೆ ಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದು ತಪ್ಪು ಎಂದಲ್ಲ. ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಧಿ ನಿಯಮಗಳಿಗೆ ಇದು ಅನುಗುಣವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಕ್ಲಾಜ್ 8ರಲ್ಲಿ "Power of State Government to notify exemptions and reductions of tax" ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಅದರ ಗುಟ್ಟು ಏನು ?

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಅದರ ಗುಟ್ಟು ಏನೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ತಮ್ಮೆಲ್ಲರ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯಗಳನ್ನು ಕಾರ್ಯಾಚರಣೆಗೆ ತರುವುದಕ್ಕೋಸ್ಕರ ಈ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ನಾಳೆ ಎ.ಐ.ಸಿ.ಸಿ. ಮೀಟಿಂಗ್ ಆದರೆ, you can exempt it.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ನಿಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದದ್ದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ.

ಇನ್ನು ಕ್ಲಾಜ್ ಮೂರರ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲವರು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಹೊತ್ತು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕನ್‌ಸ್ಯೂಮರ್ಸ್ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಇದ್ದರೆ domestic lighting, heating ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿರುವವರು ಪ್ಲಗ್ಸ್ ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಿನಿಮಂ ಶಕ್ತಿಯ ಬಳಕೆಯಮೇಲೆ ತೆರಿಗೆಕೊಡಬೇಕೋ ಅಷ್ಟನ್ನು ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದೇ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನ (ಬಿ)ಯಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಹಾಕಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ನಮಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಟ್ಯಾರಿಫ್ ಮೇಲೆ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಕನ್‌ಸ್ಯೂಮರ್ಸ್ ಮೇಲೆ ತೆರಿಗೆ ಹಾಕಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬ ಶಂಕೆ ಇದೆಯೆಂದು ಕೆಲವರು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆಗ ಅನುಮಾನ ಇಲ್ಲದ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶ, ನಮಗಾಯಿತು. ನಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಎನರ್ಜಿ ಕನ್‌ಸ್ಯೂಂ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಟ್ಯಾಕ್ಸ್ ಹಾಕಬೇಕೇ ವಿನಾ ಇನ್ನಾವುದರ ಮೇಲೂ ಹಾಕಬಾರದು. ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಏನು ಅನುಮಾನವಿದೆಯೋ ಆ ಅನುಮಾನ ಲೇಶಾಂಶವೂ ಇರಕೂಡದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಅಂತಹ ಅನುಮಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಆಸ್ಪದವಿಲ್ಲದ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಈ ಒಂದು ಸಣ್ಣ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧರಾಗಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅಬ್ಜೆಕ್ಷನ್ಸ್ ಏನೇನು ಎತ್ತಿದ್ದರೋ ಅದಕ್ಕೆಲ್ಲ ಅನುಮಾನ ಬಂದಕೂಡಲೆ ಸಾಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಆಗಾಗ್ಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಆ ವಿಷಯವಾಗಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ತಾವೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮೊದಲೇ ಹೇಳಿದಂತೆ ಒಂದು ಸಣ್ಣ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಮಂಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆಯನ್ನು ಬೇಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಜೆ. ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪ.—ಕ್ಲಾಜ್ ಎಂಟರಲ್ಲಿ, not clear my doubt.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ.—ಹಿಂದೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವರಿಗೆ domestic lighting, domestic heating, lift irrigation, minor industries ಇವುಗಳ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿತ್ತು. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಈಗಲೂ ಇವುಗಳಿಗೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮಲ್ಲಾರಾಧ್ಯರು, ಮತ್ತು ಇತರರು ಸೂಚನೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟರು. ಆದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮನೋಭಾವದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾರಿಗೂ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿಕೊಡಕೂಡದು ಎಂಬ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿದ್ದರೂ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರ ಒತ್ತಾಯದಮೇಲೆ ಇಂಥಿಂಥಾದ್ದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಪರ್ಸನಲ್ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಸಹಕಾರಿಯಾಗಿ ಈ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ಇರಲಿ ಎಂದು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇವೆ. ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸ್ವೇಚ್ಛೆಯಾಗಿ ತಮಗೆ ಇಷ್ಟ ಬಂದ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ 'On energy supplied or consumed for any specified purpose or (ii) by any class of consumers.' ಈ ರೀತಿ

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಎಂ. ಚನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ)

ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿ ಬಳಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ವಿನಾಯಿತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ನನ್ನ ಸ್ನೇಹಿತರಾದಂಥ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಮುಕ್ಕಣ್ಣಪ್ಪನವರು ಇಂಥಿಂಥಾದಕ್ಕ ತೆರಿಗೆ ವಜಾಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಆ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಗೆ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರೆಲ್ಲರೂ ಅಂಗೀಕಾರಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಕೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore Electricity (Taxation on Consumption) Bill, 1959, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the Bill will be read clause by clause. Clause 2. The question is :

"That Clause 2 stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 2 was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Clause 3.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Sir, I beg to move the following amendment :

'That in proviso to clause 3, after the words "energy supplied to a consumer" the words "for non-domestic purposes" shall be inserted.'

Mr. SPEAKER.—Amendment moved:

'That in proviso to clause 3, after the words "energy supplied to a consumer" the words "for non-domestic purposes" shall be inserted.'

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—There is nothing to add to what I have already said. It is only intended to remove the doubts in the minds of the people in regard to taxation on energy.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

'That in proviso to clause 3, after the words "energy supplied to a consumer" the words "for non-domestic purposes" shall be inserted.'

The motion was adopted.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That Clause 3, as amended, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 3, as amended, was added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That Clauses 4 to 14, both inclusive, stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clauses 4 to 14, both inclusive, were added to the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble stand part of the Bill."

The motion was adopted.

Clause 1, the Title and the Preamble were added to the Bill.

Motion to pass.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—I beg to move :

"That the Mysore Electricity (Taxation on Consumption) Bill, 1959, as amended, be passed."

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore Electricity (Taxation on Consumption) Bill, 1959, as amended, be passed."

The motion was adopted

MYSORE LEGISLATURE SALARIES (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1959.

Motion to consider.

Sri T. SUBRAMANYA (Minister for Law, Labour and Local Self-Government).—I beg to move :

"That the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1959, be taken into consideration."

Mr. SPEAKER.—Motion moved :

"That the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1959, be taken into consideration."

HON'BLE MEMBERS.—We agree.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The question is :

"That the Mysore Legislature Salaries (Amendment) Bill, 1959, be taken into consideration."

The motion was adopted.